UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,888	09/09/2003	Alan Earl Swahn		2635

7590 07/09/2007

ALAN EARL SWAHN
95 KARA DRIVE
NORTH ANDOVER, MA 01845

EXAMINER	
WHIPPLE, BRIAN P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/657,888	SWAHN, ALAN EARL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian P. Whipple	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *9/9/3*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in this application and presented for examination.

Claim Objections

2. As to claim 6, "number webpages" should read "number **of** webpages."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. As to claim 8, the meaning of "the computer processor(s)" is unclear. The phrase lacks antecedent basis. Additionally, it could refer to either the client or server processor(s).

6. As to claim 12, the meaning of "one or more hyperlink lists returned by a plurality of search engines" is unclear. It is unclear how a single hyperlink list is returned by more than one search engine.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Berstis, U.S. Patent No. 6,182,122 B1 or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Berstis, in view of Yates et al. (Yates), U.S. Patent No. 6,167,438.

9. As to claim 1, Berstis discloses a method for retrieving and viewing webpages in a web browser (Col. 4, ln. 63-64), comprising:

loading a plurality of webpages referred to by said hyperlink list into a queue (Abstract, ln. 5-13); and

viewing said webpages in a web browser (Col. 4, ln. 63-64).

Berstis may be interpreted as disclosing receiving a hyperlink list from a search engine (Abstract, ln. 5-13). The pages or portions of pages likely to be accessed (based on criteria such as link relationships and statistical information) are determined and transmitted to the subscriber. This may be interpreted as being a search done to find a list of content and/or links that are then sent to the recipient. However, Berstis does not explicitly disclose as much.

On the other hand, Yates does explicitly disclose receiving a hyperlink list from a search engine (Col. 4, ln. 53-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Berstis by receiving a hyperlink list from a search engine as taught by Yates in order to split the load between a remote service provider and a cache server for the additional purpose of pushing the data closer to the clients (Yates: Col. 4, ln. 53-59).

10. As to claim 2, Berstis and Yates disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including where said loading is accomplished by preloading a selectable number of webpages pointed to by hyperlinks in a queue of hyperlinks (Berstis: Col. 7, ln. 8-28).

11. As to claim 3, Berstis and Yates disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including said loading is accomplished by periodically scanning a queue of hyperlinks and upon finding a hyperlink and its associated webpage that has not been preloaded, said associated webpage is then preloaded into a webpage queue (Berstis: Col. 7, ln. 8-28).

12. As to claim 4, Berstis and Yates disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including said loading is accomplished by preloading descendant webpages of

hyperlinks that exist for a plurality of webpages currently displayed in a web browser (Berstis: Col. 10, ln. 18-47).

13. As to claim 5, Berstis and Yates disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including said loading is accomplished by preloading descendant webpages, where such preloaded webpages are not yet displayed in a web browser (Berstis: Col. 10, ln. 18-47).

14. As to claim 6, Berstis and Yates disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including said loading is accomplished by concurrently preloading a predetermined number webpages pointed to by hyperlinks in a queue of hyperlinks (Berstis: Col. 10, ln. 18-47).

15. As to claim 7, Berstis and Yates disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including said loading is accomplished by determining the available network download bandwidth and preloading a number of webpages based on such available network download bandwidth (Berstis: Col. 10, ln. 18-47; Col. 11, ln. 16-26).

16. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis and Yates as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Martin et al. (Martin), U.S. Patent No. 5,867,706.

17. As to claim 8, Berstis and Yates disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including said loading is accomplished by determining that the computer isn't saturated and preloading a predetermined number of webpages based on such non-saturation state (Berstis: Col. 10, ln. 18-47), but are silent on determining if the computer processor(s) specifically are saturated.

However, Martin discloses determining if the computer processor(s) specifically are saturated (Col. 8, ln. 41-53).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Berstis and Yates by determining if computer processors are saturated as taught by Martin in order to avoid unacceptable response times (Martin: Col. 8, ln. 41-53).

18. Claims 9, 13, 15-16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over The Mozilla Organization (Mozilla), Mozilla 0.9.5 Releases Notes, 10/25/01, in view of Official Notice.

19. As to claim 9, Mozilla discloses tabbed browsing (Pg. 2, first bullet).

Official Notice is taken that it is well known in the art that tabbed browsing comprises displaying a plurality of fully functional webpages in a single web browser at the same time. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Mozilla with well known displaying of a plurality of webpages in a single web browser at the same time in order to allow a user

to view more than one webpage at a time without needing to open a separate instance of a browser, thus resulting in ease of use and efficient use of computer resources.

20. As to claim 13, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 9 above.

21. As to claim 15, Official Notice is taken that selecting any portion of any displayed webpages and creating a duplicate image of said any portion in a format that can be saved and used at a later time is well known in the art via features such as print screen followed by the use of programs such as Microsoft Paint. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention modify the teachings of Mozilla with the well known feature of selecting any portion of any displayed webpages and creating a duplicate image of said any portion in a format that can be saved and used at a later time in order to save webpages for future reference.

22. As to claim 16, Official Notice is taken that it is well known in the art that tabbed browsing comprises changing the number of webpages displayed in a browser at the same time. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Mozilla with the well known tabbed browsing feature of changing the number of webpages displayed in a browser at the same time in order to view more or less webpages in a single browser without the need for opening or closing other instances of a browser, thus resulting in ease of use and efficient use of computer resources.

23. As to claim 19, the claim is rejected for the same reasons as claim 16 above.

24. Claims 10-11, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mozilla as applied to claims 9 and 13 above, and further in view of Berstis.

25. As to claim 10, Mozilla discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 9, including displaying a plurality of webpages in a single web browser as the same time (Pg. 2, first bullet, in view of Official Notice), but is silent on said displaying is accomplished by making visible prior preloaded webpages that correspond to hyperlinks in a queue of hyperlinks.

However, Berstis does disclose said displaying is accomplished by making visible prior preloaded webpages that correspond to hyperlinks in a queue of hyperlinks (Abstract, ln. 5-13; Col. 7, ln. 8-28; Col. 10, ln. 18-47; Col. 11, ln. 16-26; the list of pages to preload is prioritized and thus may be interpreted as a queue as a queue is simply a list with order).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Mozilla by displaying prior preloaded webpages from a queue as taught by Berstis in order to minimize the connection time required by clients during peak times and prioritize which pages should be downloaded during off peak hours (Berstis: Abstract, ln. 5-13; Col. 7, ln. 8-28).

26. As to claim 11, Mozilla discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 9, but is silent on said displaying includes webpages from a prior saved hyperlink list. However, Berstis discloses said displaying includes webpages from a prior saved hyperlink list (Col. 7, ln. 8-28; Col. 8, ln. 41-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Mozilla by displaying webpages from a prior saved hyperlink list as taught by Berstis in order to minimize the connection time required by clients during peak times and prioritize which pages should be downloaded during off peak hours (Berstis: Abstract, ln. 5-13; Col. 7, ln. 8-28).

27. As to claim 17, Mozilla discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 9, but is silent on saving the hyperlink references to any of the webpages displayed or queued for display as a group bookmark hyperlink list that may be loaded and displayed in a web browser at a later time.

However, Berstis discloses saving the hyperlink references to any of the webpages displayed or queued for display as a group bookmark hyperlink list that may be loaded and displayed in a web browser at a later time (Col. 7, ln. 8-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Mozilla by saving the hyperlink references to any of the webpages displayed or queued for display as a group bookmark hyperlink list that may be loaded and displayed in a web browser at a later time in order to bookmark

frequently visited webpages, thus increasing ease of use by eliminating the need to remember and enter a web address repeatedly.

28. As to claim 20, Mozilla discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 13, but is silent on selectively copying a portion of the queue of hyperlinks that represent webpages displayed or queued for display to a secondary favorites queue of hyperlinks for later display.

However, Berstis does disclose selectively copying a portion of the queue of hyperlinks that represent webpages displayed or queued for display to a secondary favorites queue of hyperlinks for later display (Col. 7, ln. 8-28).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Mozilla by selecting from hyperlinks displayed or to be displayed to be copied into favorites for later display as taught by Berstis in order to precache frequently visited webpages as to avoid traffic during peak time (Berstis: Col. 7, ln. 8-28).

29. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mozilla as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Yates.

30. As to claim 12, Mozilla discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 9, including displaying a plurality of webpages in a single web browser as the same time

(Pg. 2, first bullet, in view of Official Notice), but is silent on said displaying includes webpages from one or more hyperlink lists returned by a plurality of search engines. However, Yates does disclose receiving a hyperlink list from a search engine (Col. 4, ln. 53-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Mozilla by receiving a hyperlink list from a search engine as taught by Yates in order to split the load between a remote service provider and a cache server for the additional purpose of pushing the data closer to the clients (Yates: Col. 4, ln. 53-59).

31. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mozilla as applied to claim 13 above, further in view of Microsoft, Microsoft Accessibility Update Newsletter, October 2001, and further in view of Berstis.

32. As to claim 14, Mozilla discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 13, but is silent on said operating is accomplished by changing the initial magnification factor of any or all preloaded webpages prior to visible display and said initial magnification factor is capable of being overridden once a webpage is displayed.

However, Microsoft discloses said operating is accomplished by changing the initial magnification factor of any or all webpages prior to visible display and said initial magnification factor is capable of being overridden once a webpage is displayed (Pg. 8, step 3; the user may turn on or off the ignoring of default fonts).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Mozilla by changing the initial magnification factor of any or all webpages prior to visible display and overriding said initial magnification factor once a webpage is displayed as taught by Microsoft in order to provide accessibility options to users (Microsoft: Pg. 5, ¶ 1).

Mozilla and Microsoft are silent on preloading webpages.

However, Berstis does disclose preloading webpages (Abstract, ln. 5-13; Col. 7, ln. 8-28; Col. 10, ln. 18-47; Col. 11, ln. 16-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Mozilla and Microsoft by preloading webpages as taught by Berstis in order to minimize the connection time required by clients during peak times and prioritize which pages should be downloaded during off peak hours (Berstis: Abstract, ln. 5-13; Col. 7, ln. 8-28).

33. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mozilla and Berstis as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Yates.

34. As to claim 18, Mozilla and Berstis disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 17, but are silent on the additional capability of saving the search content that enables a plurality of search engines to return hyperlink lists based on said search context.

However, Yates does disclose the additional capability of saving the search content that enables a plurality of search engines to return hyperlink lists based on said search context (Col. 4, ln. 53-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Mozilla and Berstis by receiving and saving the search index used by a search engine as taught by Yates in order to split the load between a remote service provider and a cache server for the additional purpose of pushing the data closer to the clients (Yates: Col. 4, ln. 53-59).

Conclusion

35. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached Notice of References Cited (PTO-892).

36. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian P. Whipple whose telephone number is (571) 270-1244. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30 AM to 5:00 PM EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on (571) 272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

BPW

Brian P. Whipple
6/20/07

BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

7/3/7